



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/965,938

09/27/2001

Alec Mahendra Bandara Ekanayake

JP920000472US1

3363

7590

08/09/2005

JAMES BOICE, ESQ.  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
8911 NORTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY  
SUITE 2110  
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

BARNIE, REXFORD N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/965,938

Applicant(s)

EKANAYAKE ET AL.

Examiner

REXFORD N. BARNIE

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 41-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 41-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

*Rexford N. Barnie*  
REXFORD BARNIE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. A non-industry standard format negotiated between the foreign network administrator and the local network administrator. According to (page 6), a conversion system (36) of administration system (32) converts information received in a format conforming to the foreign provider requirements into a format conforming to home provider requirements.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21, 41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouckman et al. (US Pat# 6,134,307) in view of Gallagher et al. (US Pat# 5,907,603).

**Regarding claim 21**, Brouckman teaches a call conversion process for a business system for a business system for a global telecommunications network teaches receiving call data at a network from a foreign network wherein call detail records or AMA have to be reconciled for parties including those roaming for instance (see figs. 1-6). According to Brouckman, CDR, arguably made up of different fields, has to be validated from a first format and if the data field(s) in the first format passes the validation process, the converting the call data file into a second format based on some user-defined codes or instructions.

Brouckman fails to teach that call data record or call data would be made up of different fields for conversion from one format to another.

Gallagher teaches an automatic message accounting system, which would use a plurality of fields when constructing AMA records in (see col. 4 line 20-col. 6 line 11). The data would be defined by parameters including size, data format, validation data

and so forth. Gallagher teaches, in summary, the ability to convert possibly AMA or CDR from one exchange in a first format to a second format in (see col. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gallagher into that of Brouckman thus making it possible to detect AMA data based on its different fields for billing purposes and to be able to communicate with other service providers for billing Settlements.

**Regarding claim 41**, Brouckman teaches a call conversion process for a business system for a business system for a global telecommunications network teaches receiving call data at a network from a foreign network wherein call detail records or AMA have to be reconciled for parties including those roaming for instance (see figs. 1-6). According to Brouckman, CDR, arguably made up of different fields, has to be validated from a first format and if the data field(s) in the first format passes the validation process, the converting the call data file into a second format based on some user-defined codes or instructions. Brouckman fails to teach that call data record or call data would be made up of different fields for conversion from one format to another.

Gallagher teaches an automatic message accounting system, which would use a plurality of fields when constructing AMA records in (see col. 4 line 20-col. 6 line 11). The data would be defined by parameters including size, data format, validation data and so forth. Gallagher teaches, in summary, the ability to convert possibly AMA or CDR from one exchange in a first format to a second format in (see col. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gallagher into that of Brouckman thus making it possible to detect AMA data based on its different fields for billing purposes and to be able to communicate with other service providers for billing Settlements.

**Regarding claim 44,** Brouckman teaches a call conversion process for a business system for a business system for a global telecommunications network teaches receiving call data at a network from a foreign network wherein call detail records or AMA have to be reconciled for parties including those roaming for instance (see figs. 1-6). According to Brouckman, CDR, arguably made up of different fields, has to be validated from a first format and if the data field(s) in the first format passes the validation process, the converting the call data file into a second format based on some user-defined codes or instructions. Brouckman fails to teach that call data record or call data would be made up of different fields for conversion from one format to another.

Gallagher teaches an automatic message accounting system, which would use a plurality of fields when constructing AMA records in (see col. 4 line 20-col. 6 line 11). The data would be defined by parameters including size, data format, validation data and so forth. Gallagher teaches, in summary, the ability to convert possibly AMA or CDR from one exchange in a first format to a second format in (see col. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gallagher into that of

Brouckman thus making it possible to detect AMA data based on its different fields for billing purposes and to be able to communicate with other service providers for billing Settlements.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 42-43 and 45-46 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

The combination teaches conversion from one format to a second format wherein the second format could use standard information but the second format is not a standard format. Standard information could include relevant information associated with the subscriber for instance and the call made for billing purposes.

***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **REXFORD N BARNIE** whose telephone number is 571-272-7492. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CURTIS KUNTZ can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER  
REXFORD BARNIE  
08/05/05

  
REXFORD BARNIE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER